

Remarks

This is responsive to the Advisory Action mailed June 3, 2005 which allowed claims 12, 14, 15, and 23-28; provided objections to claims 4-10 and 17-22; and maintained the final rejection of claims 1-3, 11, 16, and 29-32. In response the Applicant has herein amended the claims in accordance with the indication of allowed and allowable subject matter, thereby obviating all present rejections and objections. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments herein. All amendments are proper, do not add new matter, do not require additional searching by the Examiner, and place all claims in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102

The Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1 as being anticipated by Kim '173. The Applicant reiterates that Kim '173 cannot properly sustain a Section 102 rejection over previously presented claim 1 because it does not identically disclose the claimed *modulating the current, in reference to an occurrence of interference associated with an undesired air-bearing stability in an interface between a head and a surface*. (excerpt of Amended claim 1, emphasis added)

Kim '173 discloses modulating the current to the voice coil motor in relation to embedded headerless servo data. The Examiner reads the claimed "interference" as allegedly being the RRO that is created by air flowing between the head and the track during track following.

The Examiner mischaracterized the disclosure of Byun '661 in attempting to substantiate this basis for the rejection. The portion of Byun '661 on which the Examiner

relies actually discloses "deflection of the disk, poor flatness of the disk, and air flow" create the RRO. A skilled artisan recognizes that the reference to air flow means an airstream acting on the disk edge to deflect the disk edge during rotation. Although it might be possible for air-bearing instability to result in NRO, there is no basis in the record for the Examiner's assertion that air-bearing instability results in RRO.

Nonetheless, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to additionally recite the limitations of objected to claim 7, thereby obviating the rejection of claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection of claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are respectfully requested.

Allowed/Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of independent claims 12, 23, and 28 and the claims depending therefrom. The Applicant desires to clarify a misstatement by Applicant's representative in the Amendment filed on May 11, 2005; claim 23 as allowed is in its original form and has not been amended during prosecution.

Claim 1 has been amended to additionally recite the subject matter of formerly objected-to claim 7, thereby obviating the rejection of claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are respectfully requested.

Claim 16 has been canceled, but claims 18 and 19 have been placed in independent form by additionally reciting the subject matter of former claim 16 from which they formerly depended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18 and 19 and the claims depending therefrom are respectfully requested.

Claim 29 and the claims depending therefrom have been canceled, obviating the rejection thereof.

Conclusion

This is a complete response to the Advisory Action mailed June 3, 2005. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's representative below to discuss any matter preventing all pending claims from now passing to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Mitchell K. McCarthy, Registration No. 38,794
Randall K. McCarthy, Registration No. 39,297
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey and Tippens
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Telephone: (405) 232-0621
Facsimile: (405) 232-9659
Customer No. 33900